

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-16 and 18-24 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter recited in claims 5, 9 and 18, but respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The editorial amendments made to the claims to address the objections stated in paragraphs 6-8 of the Office action are self-explanatory.

The present invention is an improved technique for handling the transmission of data from a plurality of sources. The invention receives the data from these sources, and as received from these plurality of sources the data already includes control data. A feature of the invention not shown or suggested in the art is that, if the control data does not already include a reassembly indicator for use in reassembling the data traffic upon receipt, the reassembly indicator is incorporated into the existing control data without increasing the amount of the control data already present in the data traffic.

This distinctive feature of the invention has been explained in previous filings and has been emphasized clarified in the claims. The examiner now refers to the one byte trailer of Calvignac as satisfying this requirement, but it appears that the examiner may have misunderstood either Calvignac or the present invention, since Calvignac clearly does not teach what is claimed.

More particularly, while it is true that Calvignac does use the one byte trailer, this is described in the context of the Calvignac invention and one of the features of the Calvignac invention is that this trailer byte is added. Claim 1 of the present application clearly recites that

the data traffic as received from said plurality of prioritized sources includes control data, and that the reassembly indicator is incorporated into this control data without increasing the amount of the control data already present in the data traffic. Thus, the addition of a trailer byte will not satisfy claim 1, or claims 6 and 16 which recite a similar feature. There is no suggestion anywhere in Calvignac that the trailer byte used in Calvignac is already present in the data as received from the various sources, and there is certainly no reason why it would have been.

It is unnecessary to analyze in detail the secondary art relied on by the examiner in rejecting other claims, other than to note that it does not teach the feature lacking in Calvignac, i.e., the adaption of the existing control data to include the reassembly indicator without increasing the amount of control data already used.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 25, 2006

/DJCushing/
David J. Cushing
Registration No. 28,703